BEFORE THE

CALIFORNIA BUREAU OF STATE AUDITS (BSA)

In the matter of

Citizens Redistricting Commission (CRC)

Applicant Review Panel (ARP) Public Meeting

555 Capitol Mall, Suite 300

Sacramento, CA 95814

MONDAY, AUGUST 16, 2010

9:15 A.M.

Reported by:

Peter Petty

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC
(415) 457-4417

APPEARANCES

Members Present

Nasir Ahmadi, Chair

Mary Camacho, Vice Chair

Kerri Spano, Panel Member

STAFF PRESENT

Donna Neville, Panel Counsel

Diane Hamel, Executive Secretary

INTERVIEWEES

Charles Turner

Jerry S. Turem

INDEX

PROCEEDINGS

MS. NEVILLE: It's 9:15. We are back on the record. I notice we have the presence of a quorum. Welcome.

Good morning, Mr. Walker -- Mr. Turner. I apologize.

Mr. Turner, I'm starting with the first of my five standard questions.

What specific skills do you believe a good Commissioner should possess? Of those skills, which do you possess? Which do you not possess and how will you compensate for it? Is there anything in your life that would prohibit or impair your ability to perform the duties of a Commissioner?

MR. TURNER: I think there are a number of important skills, and all the Commissioners should possess at least some of them.

First and pretty fundamentally is an ability to work well with others and compromise effectively. I think if you can't do that, you're in trouble.

Secondly, I think a knowledge of California demographics and California diversity in the broad sense of that meaning is important to have.

I think analytical skills, a facility with math or statistics could be a very useful skill to have as a

Commissioner because of the type of work that's going to be involved, an understanding of voting behavior, of all the many different things that lead people in California to either participate or not participate in politics.

Probably the most fundamental is the desire to create competitive districts in a fair manner. Obviously that's the job, but really having that desire and believing that's an important thing for California to do is fundamental to the job.

I think a familiarity with tools like GIS and experience in drawing electoral districts would be very useful to have.

And finally, an ability to be fair and impartial. I think that's a skill that most of us like to think we possess, but I think some people do it better than others. And hopefully the Commission will consist of people who are very good at that.

I think of the skills that I possess, hopefully most of those, some of them are fairly subjective. Others are more objective, like background with math and statistics. That's something I do as part of my profession. A familiarity with voting in California, with the demographics of our state and our political history is something that's a part of what I do professionally. So I can say with confidence I bring that to the table.

Something I don't possess is I have not used GIS software before. I've seen the results of it. It's something I believe I could compensate for by learning pretty quickly. I'm comfortable with a lot of other statistical software. And I've never drawn districts before.

I imagine there are some folks in the pool who have experience with county supervisorial districts or if they live in a city where the counsel districts are drawn that way, they may have that experience. And that's an experience I don't have.

And there's nothing in my life that would impair my ability to perform the duties of a Commissioner.

MS. NEVILLE: Thank you.

Describe a circumstance from your personal experience where you had to work with others to resolve a conflict or difference of opinion. Please describe the issue and explain your role in addressing and resolving the conflict. If you are selected to serve on the Citizen's Redistricting Commission, tell us how you would resolve conflicts that may arise among the Commissioners.

MR. TURNER: I've spent the last eight years serving on a Human Resources Commission for the city of Chico. This is a Commission that was started a number of years ago to deal with the city's efforts in equal

employment opportunity and in meeting affirmative action goals.

And over the years, particularly after the passage of Prop. 209, there began to develop a sense, both within the Human Resources staff for the city and amongst some Commissioners as well, that human resources as a Commission had sort of outlived its usefulness and it was no longer necessary as a City Commission. This also coincided in the past few years with an effort to reduce the number of boards and commissions for fiscal years.

So what we ended up with was over the last three or four years a conflict emerging over whether or not this Commission should exist. And it came down to -- what it eventually came to determine was not a difference in our underlying beliefs about what's important for the city of Chico, but really a more technical and process manner about how do we go about achieving that. And that's actually the way that we were able to eventually resolve the conflict. We were able to step back from should the Human Resources Commission exist and instead focus on our goal is valuing diversity as a community, making Chico a more inclusive place, making the hiring process fair and transparent to folks. How can we best achieve that?

And eventually, this year, we were able to come to a solution. And as a Commission, we've now agreed to

at the end of this year dissolve ourselves as a Commission in exchange for the creation of an Ad Hoc Committee that will develop a diversity action plan for the city. That plan will then have its function carried out in part by city counsel directly and, in fact, by another existing Committee. And we'll end up with one less Commission, but we will have done so in a way that still allows us to focus on that bigger objective of making Chico a diverse and inconclusive place.

So I think the way I would resolve conflict on the Citizen's Redistricting Commission would be in a similar manner, in focusing on the underlying principles that are really important to what our goal is here. I think it's easy sometimes to get bogged down in the specifics. And I think if we start out by talking about and agreeing to those underlying principles, we all want to have better districts in California. We all want them to be drawn in a way that's fair and impartial. And if we can bring ourselves back to that from time to time whenever we get bogged down in one of the 124 little issues to bring it back to that bigger picture, I think we'll be able to resolve compromise well.

MS. NEVILLE: How will the Commission's work impact the state? Which of these impacts will improve the state the most? And is there any potential for the

Commission's work to harm the state? And if so, in what ways?

MR. TURNER: This is my favorite question. This is an exciting one for a political scientist, because part of our job is trying to predict the future. But social scientists, we are usually very bad at it, because we're dealing with human behavior. And that's little difficult.

I gave a lot of thought to this, and I think there are probably three primary effects that I think the Commission could have.

One, most importantly and most fundamentally, I think we can reduce the number of safe legislative seats in the state of California. I think that we can do that by still preserving geographic integrity, but we can examine how those lines are drawn. We can draw them in a way that is going to create a situation where in any particular district we'll have a more competitive situation than we have now. That doesn't necessarily mean we're going to get a different outcome in an election. I think that's a secondary issue.

I think what's important is having races where all the candidates feel like they have to speak to a broader cross section of their constituency and of the districts. And it really doesn't take that much I think in a lot of the districts that exist. By just tipping

that median point a few percentage points in one direction or the other, we create a system where there's more responsiveness on behalf of the candidates.

I think secondly, what a positive impact the Commission could have is to play a role in raising public awareness. I think that what's typically happened in redistricting in the past is the Legislature does its job. It's approved. There's an article in the Sacramento Bee and everyone moves on with their life and that's kind of it over ten years. I think because this is a new process, a different one, one that we, the voters, put into place, there's going to be a heightened level of attention.

I think that with the community forums, I think we're speaking to people around the state. We're going to have local media writing articles about this. More thought is going to be given to it. And I think there's going to be more of a spotlight on not only the redistricting process, but on the elections that happen -- in the first few elections that happen after this process. I think that's an opportunity to educate more about the voting process, to get people more involved in politics and hopefully have a secondary effect in possibly increasing voter turnout as well, which will be great.

And I think the third thing is if we do our job well, it will force political parties to change their

campaign strategy somewhat. I think with safe seats, you know if ten of the 120 legislative races are really all that's in play, the Democrats and Republicans can really just focus their efforts on a few races and most of the rest of the state gets left out of that process. I think by increasing the number of competitive races, you force the political parties to re-examine that strategy and to pay attention to greater portions of the state of California and work a little harder at showing how they want to represent us as citizens. I think that's a positive thing.

There is a potential for harm. I think if we do our job well, we can avoid it. The risk is if we create districts that are no better than what we've got now or even if we create ones that are slightly better or a few of them are better, if it looks like we went to a lot of trouble and didn't get a better result, I think that could have a negative effect on the public who can be prone towards some synthesism about politics. If they look at this whole process and say, "Wow, we put all this effort into it and still didn't get a better result," I think that could be depressing for folks.

Or the possible negative thing that could happen is if we don't pay enough attention to existing communities that have been created by the current

legislative districts. We certainly don't need to be browned to what exists right now, but there's some legislative districts that have been essentially the same for decades in California. And just by the nature of their existence, they may have created a sense of political community that we need to take into mind as part of the equation, not the lines themselves, but the communities that they may have created.

MS. NEVILLE: Very good.

Describe a situation where you've had to work as part of a group to achieve a common goal. Tell us about the goal, describe your role within the group, and tell us how the group worked or did not work collaboratively to achieve this goal. If you're selected to serve on the Commission, tell us what you would do to foster collaboration.

MR. TURNER: I've spent the last ten or so years working in a group of about 35 to 40 people for the Political Science Department at Chico State. And as you probably know, academics can be a pretty feisty bunch. We have a department that has seven different independent programs within it. So people have different particular interests. Some folks are interested in international relations, others in criminal justice, and everything in between. So we've got people who are headed a lot of

different directions at different times.

This group recently encountered a challenge from our campus, and it really forced us to focus on our common goals and the things that we all want to achieve. I think our common goal is high quality learning environment for our students who want to teach people about politics. And the threat was a change in our campus general education program that might decrease our ability to serve the entire campus in an introduction to American government course. It would change the rules of who had to take that course. And we thought that could be a real negative to education at Chico state.

So there was some folks who wanted to resist the change entirely. There were other folks who were somewhat ambivalent about it, because they didn't teach the course. But what we were able to ultimately do was come together and focus on the common goal of educating the entire campus.

And so in seeing that that change was probably going to be inevitable, instead of fighting to resist it, what we did was took an opportunity to transform the nature of that course by adding a civic education component to it called a town hall forum, and it took the efforts of not just a few people in the department because, we teach about 1200 students every semester in

that course, it took a lot of us learning a few ways to teach the course and presenting this improved product to the campus in order to be ensured of our ability to maintain teaching a course to the entire campus that we really value as a group.

The way that I would foster collaboration on the Commission would be to stress this common purpose. We really have a duty to the voters of California, and we have a duty to work really hard and really fast. 2012 is not very far away. And there's some pretty strict deadlines that have to be met. And I think by stressing that common purpose and really reminding ourselves to stick to the task, that I have something to offer the Commission. We also --

MS. HAMEL: Five minutes.

MR. TURNER: -- have a need to compromise. We need to pick our battles. We're not going as individuals to get our way every single time. And I think I have a good ability to adapt as needed in that situation.

MS. NEVILLE: A considerable amount of the Commission's work will involve meeting with people from all over California who come from very different backgrounds and very different perspectives. If you're selected to serve on the Commission, tell us about the specific skills you possess that will make you effective

in interacting with the public.

MR. TURNER: I feel like I have a real advantage here in my experience. I didn't grow up in California, so there's not a lot of California's political culture that I take for granted. But rather, I moved here 16 years ago with the specific goal in mind of learning about politics. And so that's what I've been focused on the entire time I've lived in California. I've sought out diverse experiences because those are things that really do matter to me.

As university professor and my work with Junior Statesman of America and my work with the League of Women Voters, I come across a pretty diverse cross section of California on a regular basis, people from all over the state of California, people from different backgrounds, people who may be the first person in their family to go to college, people who in my work with the League of Women Voters who come from all over the community and have a lot of different interests in what they want to see our government doing.

I've also through my experience in volunteering, not only with the League but also with Big Brothers, Big Sisters, catalyst domestic violence services, I encounter on a regular basis folks with backgrounds that are very different from my own. And I believe that I've developed

through these experiences a real capacity for empathy, for trying to understand folks whose lives are different from mine.

I also feel like I have a calm demeanor. I've been told I have a soothing voice. Hopefully you find it somewhat soothing. I don't think I'm easily rattled, and I think I can use that calmness to de-escalate tensions that can sometimes occur, whether in a public forum, whether in a meeting of the Commission. And that can really help in a tense group conflict situation bring us down to a calm level.

MS. NEVILLE: Thank you.

Mr. Ahmadi, your 20 minutes.

CHAIR AHMADI: Thank you. Good morning, Dr. Turner.

MR. TURNER: Good morning.

CHAIR AHMADI: The first question of the first few questions I have is in relation to the information that you provided on the application. Let me start with your responsibility as a faculty member of the Chico State. At some point, you have supervised 36 faculty in your department. And those were your staff when you were dealing with them. What types of staff do you envision being essential to work on the Commission?

MR. TURNER: I think in addition to my 36

colleagues who are other professionals, we also have three administrative staff who, in my role of Chair, I've been direct supervisor over for going on three years now. And that's probably the best analogy for how I see the Commission working with staff as well.

Also, I've employed research assistants that I think would be a good analogy, too. It's a really big job. And when it comes to finding folks or finding communities around the state that we need to understand better and to get in touch with, when it comes to better understanding the history of voter registration, voter turnout in different parts of the state, I think that's where we can utilize staff that can do some of that background research and that can help us coordinate the events that we need to have in order to get the information from today's voters.

CHAIR AHMADI: So what kind of information do you think, in detailed terms? What kind of data or information do you think the Commission will have to have during the first days as it starts its work?

MR. TURNER: Well, for the data part, I think we need to have information on party registration. I think we need to have information on voter turnout as well. And also to the extent possible that broader more qualitative type information about what the voters in different

communities around California see as the things that unite them. I think if we stick just to Democrats and Republicans and that kind of view of who voters are, we lose out on something.

Democrats and Republicans where I come from up in Butte County mean something a little bit different than Democrats and Republicans in San Francisco perhaps or in Orange County. So going beyond just those numbers and holding forums where we can hear from the voters and hear really what it means to them to be a voter and to feel represented is key.

CHAIR AHMADI: Could you please tell us what factors -- or than political preferences as you mentioned being a Democrat or Republican. Beyond that, what factors may contribute to uniting people around a common goal?

MR. TURNER: I think when we use a term like "political culture," really what we're talking about is culture much more broadly than just voting. I think we're talking about the things that can unite a community demographically. Race and ethnicity certainly plays a role. We have communities in California that developed decades ago around living situations where people came together as groups sometimes willingly, sometimes not willingly, and over generations have formed an identity related to the community where they live.

I think we need to be sensitive to that, particularly when we're looking at larger urban areas where you have to draw lines through a community. I think it's a little less of a problem in rural areas where you're taking in a huge geographic area anyway and the line that you draw is not where anyone lives. I think it's a much more sensitive issue when we're looking at urban communities.

CHAIR AHMADI: Thank you.

Could you please give us a little more specifics about those factors? For example, when you compare Chico with San Diego, for example, in your mind, what different types of factors contribute to the people's preferences in terms of politics?

MR. TURNER: I think a lot of it has to do not only with the individual, but where they see themselves as coming from and what the people around them are doing as well.

Most people who live in Chico are not farmers. But we come from a part of the state where agriculture is pretty important. So I think even the city dwellers have more of an interest in paying attention to how water is distributed throughout the state and this sort of north/south or inland coastal division than folks in San Diego might -- who might be concerned about water, but

less from an agricultural standpoint and more from a consumer standpoint. So I think that's a good example of the type of issue that goes well beyond being a Democrat or Republican and speaks to really feeling a part of your region.

CHAIR AHMADI: Okay. Thank you, sir.

The next question I have is I'm going to read it to you. It's somewhat long. You mentioned in your classes you address a variety of issues. And one of the issue that you mention is the rise of the Latino voting demographics. What factors do you believe are contributing to this raise and how does this raise affect your decision when redrawing the lines?

MR. TURNER: Okay. The factors that account for the rise of the voting demographic are a couple of things.

One is the rise in the population generally.

Secondly is the interplay of first generation, second generation, third generation Latinos in the state of California where you have communities that at one time may not have been very involved in the political process through language barriers, through a sense of belonging to a different voting culture. Immigrants who come to the U.S. as adults may have seen themselves as part of a different political culture and have a hard time identifying with the one they now find themselves in. As

those generational changes occur, you get a Latino population today that is becoming more of a real player in California politics. I think you see that evidenced in the demographics of the State Legislature over the past few decades. And I think the more that people see, hey, there's an opportunity for folks like me, folks from my background to be involved in politics, that that's pretty -- that plays a pretty strong role in people wanting to vote more and people wanting to participate more in the political process when they see a positive outcome from it.

CHAIR AHMADI: Thanks.

You have been appointed to numerous committees and boards. Are any of these appointments by the State Legislature or the Governor or his staff or the Board of Equalization?

MR. TURNER: No. It's only about within the city of Chico or at my university.

CHAIR AHMADI: Have you had any interaction with the State Legislature or the Governor's office or their staff or the Board of Equalization in the last ten years?

MR. TURNER: Yes. The interactions that you've had with the State Legislature and other elected and appointed folks in Sacramento has been in a couple of capacities.

One is when I worked for the Junior Statesman of America group which is bringing high school students to Sacramento for a week in the summer. I've had the role of introducing folks to high school students and to helping lead questions and discussions.

In my work for the League of Women Voters, I'm currently serving as the Voter Services Director, which is a voter outreach and education position. So I coordinate events where we bring candidates for the legislative offices to a debate in Chico. So that's been -- both of those have been largely procedural roles.

The interactions in which I've tried to influence the decision making of the Legislature has largely been through my capacity as the university professor and writing my legislator or going to my legislator's office, as a member of my union asking for money, as most of us do. But not in a professional capacity as a citizen and as a professor.

CHAIR AHMADI: So you mention that you have been somewhat influencing the political preferences or maybe within your course of program that you teach at Chico state. Could you be a little more specific about, you know, what are some of your personal preferences or personal -- what are some of the goals when you say influencing others or to influence others?

MR. TURNER: Well, influencing others as a professor in the classroom, my fundamental goal there is critical thinking and influencing people to really think carefully about what politics means and what they want out of it.

Butte County is kind of a neat part of California I think in that we have this sort of Democratic part surrounded by all these Republican parts. So when you look at the typical students that arrive at Chico state, they're coming kind of with some pieces of both of those things, but also a lot of confusion about what all that means.

And so what I try to do in the classroom is force students to really think through the conclusions that they're coming to and we always end up with a classroom where we can debate both sides of an issue. And that's my central goal, that whatever your conclusion is, you've thought through both sides of an argument.

CHAIR AHMADI: So could you please tell us how you think California's rich diversity impacts representational or voter preferences?

MR. TURNER: Yeah, we get a lot of points of view when you have almost 40 million people to deal with. You're guaranteed to have that anyway. But if we were less diverse as a state, we would have a more homogenous

point of view.

I think particularly when you look at the immigrant population of California coming from countries in Asia, coming from countries in Latin America, really coming from all the around the world, but those two, in particular, influence means a lot of people are bringing with them a family culture and a family history that relates to politics in a different way than American political culture might do typically. So maybe there is a greater emphasis that the role the family should play as opposed to the role that the government should play and that influences voting decisions as well.

So, you know, so you end up with folks who might want to label as social liberals, but at the same time they don't see certain functions that we would typically identify social liberal function to be the government's role. They want them to be the role of family or of church or of some other community, just for example.

CHAIR AHMADI: Thank you, sir.

Switching gears here a little bit about the technical aspects of the redistricting work that you're going to be doing should you be selected, could you tell us the benefits and detriments of geographic shape of a district?

MR. TURNER: Yeah. I think the benefits of

looking at geography is that you have an opportunity to put people together in a way that they feel a sense of common interest and representation. Like the example from Butte County where we have Democrats and Republicans, but we have certainly a majority of folks, regardless of political party, who have an interest in the way that northern California has access to water. So there is an example of where geography can be used in a positive way to keep folks together who may have common interest. And whether they end up being represented by Democrat or Republican, they're going to be represented by someone who shares that interest.

The negative way that geography impacts us politically as Californians is that it tends to over-emphasize this sense of place; right? If you look particularly at communities where folks may live in one legislative district and go to work in another legislative district and go to church in yet a third legislative district, there's really no way that we can say, well, this is where we should draw the line because this is who you are. Well, this is where I live, but that may not be all of how I identify myself and what's important to me. So there are inevitably going to be limitations to what geography can do.

I don't have a better solution than geography and

I think any other solution has drawbacks as well. If we just took the entire state of California and made it into one big proportionally represented district, I think there's some drawbacks, too, because you would end up with geography not playing a big enough role.

MS. HAMEL: Five minutes.

CHAIR AHMADI: Thank you.

As you may know, the first eight Commissioners will have the responsibility to select the other six to make it a 14-member Commission. In terms of the deadlines and the time frame that's available, I believe that's going to take place somewhere between November 15 or the last week of November, for example. And then -- are you available from November 15 to December 30th of this year?

MR. TURNER: Yes. Due to the academic schedule that's actually -- particularly once you get into December, there are days off. We have a week off at Thanksgiving.

My current role is one where I'm teaching a class on Monday evenings and that's it right now. The rest of my tasks are administrative, which means that I can adjust my schedule as needed.

CHAIR AHMADI: How about the spring semester?

MR. TURNER: Yeah, we have -- I've been thinking about the big, big task that is 2011 for this Commission.

And in my employment, I have an opportunity to take something called a difference in pay leave for a semester, which means I could be away from Chico for the entire spring semester and summer and receive reduced pay in order to free up my time to focus full time on the work of the Commission.

CHAIR AHMADI: Thank you, sir. No more questions.

MS. NEVILLE: Ms. Camacho, your 20 minutes.

VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: Hello, Mr. Turner.

MR. TURNER: Good morning.

VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: I have a few questions for you. You were talking about one of the harms could be that the Commission could look like we went to a lot of trouble and did not get a better result. Can you expand on your thought? To ensure that this doesn't occur, how would you ensure that this doesn't occur?

MR. TURNER: Well, I think one of the most important initial things that we can do to address that issue is to continue with the excellent example that has been set so far in terms of transparency: I think work of this panel in making everything readily available on the Internet, making everything in real time so that the entire state can access it is extremely important.

We would really need to make sure that the voters

didn't feel like this is behind closed doors kind of decision, that it's really a negotiations of special interests. I think through transparency we can make that happen.

The other thing I think is important is to make sure that we hear every voice that wants to be heard in the state of California. And I think holding meetings is important. I think holding virtual meetings is important as well because it's a big state, and we're not going to be able to, as 14 people, be present in every community in California. But what we can do is make ourselves available to everyone in the state of California by utilizing technology.

VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: Is there anything else other than the transparency and the public forums you're discussing?

MR. TURNER: We have to do a good job of drawing the districts, too. We have to end up with something that is different enough from what we have today and something that we can defend in terms of explaining why the resulting maps that we end up with are an improvement over what we have now.

And then I think the real test comes in the elections that are held afterwards. And I think it will be important to collect data that examines how voters

behave in that election. And I think we'll be able to show some positive outcomes there, but I think that needs to be proactive as well. I think that part of the Commission's role needs to be to continue to analyze and assess what happens during campaigns and elections over this next ten-year period.

VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: I wanted to get one clarification on a statement that you made. It was regarding obtaining certain data. One of the data that you were saying you'd like to collect is party registration. Can you kind of expand on what you mean by party registration and why you would need that information?

MR. TURNER: In order to draw districts that are more competitive than today I see is part of the mission that lead to the Voters First Act to begin with.

We're going to need to make some decisions even once we account for geography and maintaining communities. Let's say do we include this neighborhood in district two or district three. And if we knew the all else being equal, the voter registration, the party registration in those different districts, then I think that becomes a relevant variable in helping make a district more competitive or less competitive.

I understand where part of our charge is to not

draw districts in a way that is to advantage or disadvantage a political party. But if you look at things like the percentage of folks in a district who are declining state voters, for example, I think that foster sense of a community's political identity and can help us draw lines better.

VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: So the political affiliation could help you draw lines. Do you think there's other things that could be more important than the political affiliations to draw those lines?

MR. TURNER: Absolutely. I think that's one of many pieces of data that we would want to have. If you look at the things like the age of a community, you get a sense of registered voters versus likely voter turnout, because we know that age is a factor that influences whether or not someone is going to vote. The more experience you have in voting, the more likely you're going to do it the next time as well. So that plays a role.

The sort of standard demographic things that we look at in terms of socioeconomic status, income, education level, race and ethnicity, those breakdowns all play a role in the picture that we can develop of a legislative district. And no one piece of data is going to be the key determining factor, but the more information

that we have on our hands, the better we can make those small decisions once we know the general shape of a district. If we want to make things more balanced and we want to make -- if we want to draw the lines in as fair a way as possible, the more information we have, the better.

VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: Okay. You also said that you moved to California to learn about politics. Why California and not any other state?

MR. TURNER: Well, I mean that in the specific sense of I moved here to go to graduate school. In that sense, I was moving here just to study politics. And you know, that had to do with the nature of, you know, choosing one school over another. I didn't know that 16 years ago I was sitting in Missouri saying, "It's got to be California," because I was looking at several different options.

But then once I got here and particularly once I started thinking about my role in teaching state and local government, I was very happy that I was in California, because we have the most interesting state in the country. It's the most diverse. It's got the most -- the largest number of political issues going on.

And just to pick on my home state for a minute, Missouri -- in Missouri, we don't have the initiative process the way that we have it in California. We don't

have the kinds of depth to political conversations that we have in California.

And so I feel just very blessed to be studying this kind of subject matter in the place where it's the most relevant and the most interesting.

VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: Okay. In your application -- and I know you've probably gone over a few of these issues, but I just want to see what else you had to add. You state, "I have given considerable thought to the problems and believe this has given me a broad perspective from which to consider the redistricting issue." What have you considered and then how will this benefit you if you become a Commissioner?

MR. TURNER: You know, I think one example of the kinds of problems that I consider is I give -- in my academic work, I give a lot of attention to the initiatives that we address seemingly consistently in the state of California. And I think that they are a great example because of where they come from, people of California, of what's on our mind of what we value, and then in how wise we are politically too, because I don't think it's any secret that a lot of times these people's initiatives that get on the ballot are getting there as a result of some maybe narrowly focused interest groups that have a lot of money to spend in order to get them on the

ballot.

But what's really impressive about Californians is that we usually see through that during the course of a campaign. I don't want to pick on any particular initiative in giving this answer, but if you look at over the last several years, there have been a few initiatives that have almost been entirely funded by a single corporation. And usually when those get on the ballot, that's where the vast sum of money is being spent, "vote yes on prop" whatever. And the message is really coming from a particular industry or a particular corporation.

And even though there's not a lot of money being spent on the other side, the voters are able to read through that something like the voter information guide, weigh the options, and make a decision that more often than not says no, we see what you're trying to do there and we don't buy that. I think the voters of California, because they vote so often, are pretty sophisticated.

I don't know if that answers your question.

VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: I was just wondering if there was anything else that you were considering. So that was pretty much what you could add?

MR. TURNER: That would be one example.

The others are the things that I'm teaching on a regular basis that every week we're looking at examples of

public policy. Obviously, most recently we've been looking at the role of same-sex marriage as a state political issue. That's always one that results in a lively classroom debate. And one that doesn't break down along these sort of more traditional Democratic/Republican lines as much as it does around things like urban and rural distinction and age distinction as well.

VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: Okay. Thank you.

You stated that you research American politics and it included a demographic analysis of American Indian populations within Congressional districts. How will this information help you if you become a Commissioner?

MR. TURNER: Well, I think that experience has been very valuable in helping me think through the question, the relationship of legislators to their constituents. The book on Indian policy -- I'm looking specifically at U.S. Congressional districts. But I think it's analogous to what we do here in California.

And one of the questions that I was interested in is how do legislators make decisions. The general school of thought is, well, they're making decisions in order to get re-elected. The reason I choose to vote for or against a particular bill is because I want to take the strategy that's going to keep me in office. And that sounds a little cynical when you say it that way. But

really, the assumption is the reason you got to office in the first place is because you share those views with your constituents.

So my question then was, well, that's what's true most of the time. What about on issues that aren't making the front page headlines every week? What about issues that affect only a small segment of the constituents in your district? How do you make those decisions?

And so I looked at this 50-year span of Congressional decision making on American Indian policy and I said, well, does it matter what percentage of your district is comprised of American Indians? And it turns out -- there's a whole book. But the short version is it turns out it does matter and it matters a little bit and it matters within a certain range.

In other words, if there's an extremely small American Indian population in your district, it probably doesn't matter much at all. If it goes into the mid range, then you are dealing with an issue that has two sides. So it becomes pretty contentious.

And then past this certain threshold, if American Indians are more than X percent of your constituency, that's a really important group for you to pay attention to.

VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: Okay. Also I was very

interested to see in your application that you were a member of the League of Women Voters. What do you contribute to that organization and what does the League provide you?

MR. TURNER: As far as what I contribute, there are two things. I serve on the Board for the Butte County League, and my role is Voter Services Director, which is mostly an educational components. So contributing easy voter guides and holding forums in which we bring candidates to speak. And then my personal role is also to give talks called the pros and cons where we look at all the initiatives that are on the ballot in each election. And I present -- we're a neutral nonpartisan organization, so my job is to present both the pros and cons of any particular issue and then try and answer questions from the community. They always come up with the questions that I can't answer, but I get back to them when I can with the right answer.

And then what do I get from my participation there is I get an opportunity to do what I really like to do, which is to study politics and to talk about politics with other people.

MS. HAMEL: Five minutes.

MR. TURNER: It forces me to pay attention to every initiative every election, which I like.

VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: With that in mind, why the League of Women Voters and not another organization?

MR. TURNER: I think initially it started out when a colleague asked me if I could fill in and perform this role of giving a talk on the pros and cons of the initiatives. And once I had done that once and could see the role that the League played, I was really drawn to their efforts to be a educational nonpartisan role in the political process. What they really want is to bring more people to the poles, to get more people to pay attention to politics, and to think about the consequences of political actions. And that's what I think is important, too.

I certainly hold some very deep personal preferences about policy, and I like having the opportunity to vote on policies and express my opinion. But I also think it's important that we educate folks as much as possible so that everyone in California can play that role.

VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: Thank you. That was my last question.

MS. NEVILLE: Ms. Spano.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Good morning.

MR. TURNER: Good morning.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: How does your background

prepare you for integrating and listening to public testimony into your decision making?

MR. TURNER: There are a couple of things I think that prepare me well as a listener. As an educator, I don't tend to be a lecturer. Most of the courses that I teach are graduate seminars, meaning my role is to facilitate discussion and to get people to think critically about issues. So in order to do that well, I have to listen sometimes at great length to a student talking about a book that they've just read and why they think these are really strong arguments for why we should change the initiative process in California or whatever the particular issue might be. I have to absorb that, and while they're talking come up with the next question to ask or the next student to call on who I know is going to give a contrary point of view so that we'll have that kind of debate and discussion.

Through my volunteer work as well, I do a lot of listening. Working with the League of Women Voters, you hear a lot of folks who come to forums because they're upset with the political system or because there is a particular issue on the ballot that they really want to vent about. And so my job then becomes really hearing what their concern is and being able to point them towards a resource or maybe a new way of thinking about an issue

that is going to give them some piece of mind.

The other thing that I do in my volunteer time is I work as a domestic violence crisis intervention counselor, which mainly involves listening and helping people make good choices.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Thank you.

Please tell us how having a diverse group of Commissioners would benefit the decision making of the Citizen's Redistricting Commission.

MR. TURNER: That's I think one of the most important things that you all have been doing over the last several months. I look at the demographic breakdown of the 120 people that you ended up with out of 30,000, and it's almost miraculous that you've been able to pay attention to the number of different demographic elements that you have and coming up with this group of 120 folks and, you know, from the things that I have read about some of the individuals, also outstandingly qualified people too. So good job.

The reason that I think that's helpful and useful is the thing that I see in the classroom every week, which is if you have a group of 20 people who all grew up in the same town who have the same background, roughly, they may have some differences, but not too many. You hear mostly one story. And sometimes in a classroom environments of

20 or 30 or 40 people, we start to develop that sort of homogenous view of whatever the particular issue might be.

But it just takes one person to raise their hand and say, "You know what? I grew up in southern California. I'm not from this area up here. And we don't think about this political issue in that way. We think about it differently."

And once the first person has said that, then it just really opens the flood gate for other folks to say, "Yeah, I've experienced this issue differently too. Charter schools, for example, in my community really create some divisions that have some negative consequences as well that maybe you're not experiencing because you grew up in Chico and there are only two high schools anyway." And that issue isn't as salient politically.

So I think that that's what's going to happen on the Commission as well. We're going to have people from all over the state with very different backgrounds who will have experienced politics differently.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: And as you find that your fellow Commissioners are so different and come from diverse backgrounds, how would you handle any discussions where they may have really strong views on a certain issue from their perspective and how would you resolve those as you decide how to draw the lines?

MR. TURNER: Well, I think the first thing that we have to shoot for is that component of empathy of really trying to understand why is this issue important to you. Why do you feel so strongly about it and what underlies that. That gets back to the focus on commonality that I talked about earlier. I think that we're going to end up with 14 people who, regardless of whatever else their specific interest might be, really care deeply about California and about political fairness and having a good process.

And I think if we can bring ourselves back to those commonalities and if we can really understand what's underlying that passion about the way a particular district should be drawn, I think we'll end up in a place where we are able to compromise and understand that, okay, this Commissioner may be really passionate about this issue, but there's another Commissioner who is going to be passionate about another issue that we have to consider as well.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: What do you see yourself -- knowing that you're a facilitator and graduate study programs mostly, do you see yourself as a facilitator on the Commission? Or what role do you see yourself or envision yourself doing?

MR. TURNER: Potentially, I feel like I've played

a number of different roles as a professional over the years. And I think it depends a lot on who the other folks in the group are.

I think those first two meetings are going to be crucial where the 14 of us get to know each other's backgrounds and strengths and weaknesses. And I think I'm adaptable enough to identify what role is going to be the most effective one for me. And that may be in facilitating. That may be in the listening that we talked about earlier. And it may mean there are some issues where I feel like I have more to contribute than others and being able to identify those and to step back when necessary to allow folks to really step into the role where they feel the most comfortable and with the most expertise.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Thank you.

Describe the extent of your media relations experience. You mentioned you have state, local, radio and newspaper and television experience.

MR. TURNER: Chico is not overflowing with political scientists. Sacramento, Los Angeles, Bay Area are to a much larger extent. So when the local media has an issue that they want to talk about to feature in a newspaper or radio or television story, I'm one of the folks they come to because I teach in that area. And

particularly state and local government, I also teach a course on Presidency or Congress.

So when the elections role around, I'm a person that they have found over the years they can come to to speak professionally. Hopefully it's quick enough for them because the media wants some short soundbites sometimes and professional enough to be of some value.

So over the last ten years, probably over 50 times I've met with journalists or television or radio folks to talk about politics and to try to put it into terms that the community is going to get something out of rather than just the academic kind of stuff.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: So when you do that, do you describe for the public in simple terms the pros and cons of an issue and take a neutral position when you do that?

MR. TURNER: Almost always. I have one radio program where I've been asked to -- like on a panel to take a particular position. I can do that as well. But usually it's trying to explain what I think is going to happen, what the two sides of an issue are. Or if it's election night, what has just happened and why did the voters decide to do things this way.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: I see. Are you comfortable being challenged and scrutinized in public and by the media?

MR. TURNER: Yes. I've done radio programs that are -- right wing would be the best way to put it. We have those AM stations in Chico, and I've been put in a position to say, "how could anyone possibly vote for that proposition" and I'm okay with that. I don't mind being challenged. I don't mind being challenged by my students in the classroom or by folks with another political point of view. But like I say, reasonable people disagree and I'm okay with that.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Okay. Thank you.

You've been on the -- you're the Chair of the Chico Human Resources Commission. I'm curious what does the term "equal opportunity" mean to you?

MR. TURNER: Equal opportunity is a term that's meant different things over time in the state of California. And I think we're in this era now where immediately after 1996 there was this big reaction to Prop. 209 where there was this assumption that it meant we have to throw all this stuff out. We can't look at race and ethnicity and gender and things like that when we're talking about hiring and retention and those kinds of practices and in public employment.

But what I think we've come to the understanding of over the last decade and a half is well, yeah, we're a state that's decided we're not looking at quotas or

formulas to determine who we should hire in this really narrow sense of affirmative action. But what we're looking at is creating diverse applicant pools and making sure that equal employment opportunity is not about just posting a sign somewhere that says, hey, there's this job opportunity, but to try to get that information to distribute that information around the community in a way it's going to get to everybody, not just the people who are in the habit of walking by the municipal building to look for the job posting.

So a lot of what the Human Resources Commission did, for example, was to first create a mailing list and a distribution list for job announcements that included all the different diverse communities of Chico and the surrounding areas. And then secondly, over the last year or so, to actually contact those communities and figure out how we can do more than just letting you know there is a job available. How can we create a situation where members from your cultural group or your religious group feel comfortable applying for those jobs versus not just knowing they exist or feel comfortable approaching city government as well.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: How do you see these -- do you feel like equal opportunity laws are still necessary?

MR. TURNER: They're definitely still necessary.

If you look just at my own county where I think we do a pretty good job at least in believing that it's important -- I think we've got a lot of ground to go still to make sure that that's the outcome.

One specific example is if you look at the gender breakdown of the Butte County labor force versus the city's hiring practices. Part of this people will say, well, these are traditionally male occupied positions. Well, you're right. That's what the tradition is. The firefighters and the policemen and the maintenance workers and the tree workers were traditionally male. Why is that?

The underlying question is: How do we start to make those more fundamental changes in a community? And I think that we have a commitment to that and the challenge is figuring out how to realize those equal opportunities in a way that's fair to everyone.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Thank you. How do you see these equal opportunity laws and the VRA working together in relation to the work of the Commission?

MR. TURNER: I think there's some good analogies there. I think some of the goals are the same, wanting to make sure that the language that we talk about sometimes in legislative districts has to do with packing and stacking and chopping. They use all these kinds of very

physical words for talking about a district that might divide a community of interest right down the middle. So that instead of an African American community feeling represented, if you crack it right down the middle, then you've got two communities that are much smaller part of different districts. And that's something we have to be sensitive too, not just in the constitutional Voting Rights Act kind of way, but also in what's sometimes the more meaningful way of going beyond, well, sure, this passes constitutional muster, but is it going to be a valuable way of dividing up the community for the purpose of a legislative district. There's certainly lines that we can draw that are legal that might not be good.

MS. HAMEL: Five minutes.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Thank you. You mentioned earlier about your teachings and you mentioned same-sex marriage. I was wondering if you can tell us how your lectures on state government topics like water, same-sex marriage, and the rise of the Latino voting demographic will benefit you on Commission work. And describe for us your understanding of the differences or similarities of these issues' impact on California's diversity, demographic, and geography.

MR. TURNER: I think that most fundamentally what it's helped me with is to be aware of the variety of

different political issues, that are essential to folks in California. And in the sense I get the opportunity to have this kind of community forum on a regular basis.

And even though I'm geographically in one place, just the fact that our university is actually about two-thirds of the students come from southern California as opposed to northern California. We actually do get a nice cross-section of folks that tend to be younger than the median or than the average voter in the state of California because they're students. So I'm getting more of that perspective.

But then, of course, the League of Women Voters forums we tend to get a demographic that's older than the average voter. So I feel like I hear from Californians all the time on what's important to them. And it helps me hear how people think about political issues, too. So that hopefully I can relate some of those experiences to what I'm hearing from Californians as they express their views on legislative districts or on the issues that would be important for them to feel represented on in the State Legislature.

I don't know if I got all of that.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: I think you did. Thank you very much.

I'm going to go back to a response to how you

analyze the American Indian population and how you would determine where their representation is and how it affects the relationship of population to the legislative districts. And I was wondering if this would be an approach that you would feel would be helpful in the Commission's work like early on in its endeavors or midway or throughout the process.

MR. TURNER: I think so. And not narrowly in the research that I personally conducted, but in the kinds of things that I have to read and be familiar with in order to do that kind of research myself, being aware of the fact that there are ways of poling the public. There are ways of examining demographics data that can help us better understand a community. It's helpful to know that if you ask people to prioritize what's important to you in the state of California, policy wise, that you're going to get a different top five list if you serve one community than if you serve another. That's an example of how that would matter for representation. The fundamental thing isn't my race or ethnicity, but my race or ethnicity may be related to what I see are important political issues.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Thank you. That's it for me right now.

MS. NEVILLE: Thank you.

Mr. Ahmadi, did you have follow-up questions at

this point?

CHAIR AHMADI: Not at this point.

MS. NEVILLE: Okay. Ms. Camacho?

VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: No.

MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Ms. Spano?

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: I'm going to wait.

MS. NEVILLE: One of the things I wanted to ask you more about had to do with something Ms. Camacho asked you earlier when she asked you about some of the things the Commission should do to reach out to the public and you referred to holding meetings, perhaps virtual meetings. And my question is: What other actions, if any, should this Commission take to really make sure that it guarantees the broadest possible environment by California citizens in the process? Are there other things it should do?

MR. TURNER: I think there are. Meetings are great, because you're letting citizens self-select. I want to come and share my views with you.

The downside is you're only hearing from citizens who feel comfortable making that positive step of going out to a public meeting, which can be intimidating, speaking maybe in front of a big group of people. So that's I think a limitation.

I think we need to look for ways to move beyond

that as well. I think things like virtual meetings where people can maybe e-mail in a question or a concern that they have are helpful.

I think looking at existing data that we don't have to re-invent the wheel as a Commission. I think there are a lot of foundations and groups in California that have studied the California electorate over the last few decades who have issued studies or reports that we can learn from.

I think there are conversations that happen in less formal settings that we as a Commission need to figure out how to hear as well; focus group kind of settings that maybe don't involve official folks. But maybe we can hear from a representative who can come to the Commission and say well, these are the things that I've learned from meeting with a group and a community that didn't take that proactive step of coming to this kind of public meeting, but that still cares about politics and wants their views represented.

MS. NEVILLE: Thank you.

I wanted to ask you a little bit more about some of the issues you've described related to the Chico Human Resources Commission. Are you currently serving on the Commission or did I understand you to say that it was disbanded?

MR. TURNER: In October, we'll have our last meeting. That will be the end of my second four-year term. And then we will cease to exist, assuming all goes as planned.

MS. NEVILLE: And you at that point won't be performing any further role?

MR. TURNER: No. No more commitments.

MS. NEVILLE: Just another question too about your work for the League of Women Voters in Butte County. While Prop. 11 was before the voters, did you do outreach on behalf of the League regarding Prop. 11?

MR. TURNER: I only do the pros and cons part of that. That's a good example of the other sort of branch of work that the League of Women Voters does as they do advocacy on behalf of voter initiatives. Never about candidates, but about the initiative process. And they have been co-sponsors of some initiatives as well. And I don't do any work that is advocacy work for the League of Women Voters, because it's -- we feel like it's very important to keep those functions separate. I was at a -- we had a meeting yesterday actually where we decided that I can't put political signs in my yard in elections because that would cross that line.

MS. NEVILLE: Okay. And so are you currently doing any work on behalf of the League related to any of

the initiatives that are approved for the ballot regarding redistricting?

MR. TURNER: No.

MS. NEVILLE: Not at all?

MR. TURNER: What I will probably do in early October is to give a talk to my community on pros and cons, but it's not an advocacy talk.

MS. NEVILLE: I wanted to ask you a little bit more about your scholarly work. On your application you referred to the fact that you summarized and categorized legal opinions. And I was curious to know if there were particular areas of the law and if you could tell us a little bit more about that.

MR. TURNER: Sure. That's been a fairly specific project, and it doesn't deal with just one area of the law. What I've have been working on, myself and two co-authors, for the past four or five years is examining the role of the concurring opinion by the Supreme Court. So we've looked from the late 1700s up through the end of the Rehnquist court examining period of time, reading opinions and then categorizing the sort of a typology of concurring behavior by Supreme Court justice. So it's a little dull, but I mention --

MS. NEVILLE: Not to me.

MR. TURNER: Interesting to attorneys.

I mention it only in the capacity of saying I've had to read legal opinions and try to figure out what they mean. And I think that's an important skill for this Commission as well is to be able to read laws and figure out, okay, in application what does that mean we need to do?

MS. NEVILLE: If you had to describe why that work was interesting or important to someone that wasn't a lawyer, what would you tell them?

MR. TURNER: The most fundamental thing to me and why I'm a social scientist is because I like trying to figure out why people do what they do. And politics is interesting to me. So the specific way that works is I want to understand why people behave a certain way politically. Why do you make this decision? Why did you -- if you agree with the majority, why didn't you just say, "I agree with the majority"? Why did you have to say, "I agree, but I also want to tell you some other things," which is essentially what a concurring opinion is. That behavior just fascinates me, why you make one choice rather than another, particularly in politics where it could have really big outcomes for the rest of us.

MS. NEVILLE: What have you learned so far, or is it too early in your research to know?

MR. TURNER: Well, our most recent article was on

the Marshall courts. So it may not be as relevant today, but I can tell you that Chief Justice Marshall didn't like people disagreeing with him. And a few concurring opinions were written back then largely because he disfavored the practice. And you see almost immediately once he steps down as people start expressing themselves more. So a lot of it's individuals and individual personality when you're talking about a small group behavior.

MS. NEVILLE: Interesting.

You talked earlier about when you were answering one of the standard questions related to conflict resolution, you talked about the importance of this Commission or these Commissioners sharing certain common principles that would guide them. What are those principles and what would you do as an individual to help instill those principles in their work?

MR. TURNER: Well, I think that's one of our really our first tasks as a Commission is to talk through what holds us together. What do we all have in common? I suspect that that conversation will lead us to conclude that the most fundamental thing we have in common is we care about the politics in the state of California and we care about representation.

Because that's really what this whole movement is

about is about making Californians feel better represented in a representative democracy. And if that's one of our underlying principles, I think a lot of other things flow from that, which would also be a concern for procedural fairness, a concern for making sure that we're making decisions that we can defend and explain to the rest of California.

I think those are some examples of underlying principles in democracy that we'll all share and that probably we'll -- 13 more folks in the conversation, we could come up with a longer list than that. And I think by referring back to that list in tough times we'll be able to make it through conflicts.

MS. NEVILLE: Thank you. I have nothing further.

Are there other follow-up questions?

CHAIR AHMADI: I don't have any.

VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: I don't have any either.

MS. NEVILLE: How much time do we have?

MS. HAMEL: Nine minutes.

MS. NEVILLE: You have nine minutes. If you'd like to make a closing statement, please feel free.

MR. TURNER. I won't take nine minutes, but I would say thank you all for the hard work that you put into this process. It's been neat to follow it on the web. I get to tune in every now and then and see what's

going on.

And I know that I'm really confident we're going to end up with a great 14-member Commission. And I'm excited to see what happens moving forward. I hope that I'm a candidate that fits these needs. But in any event, I think it's a great thing and I'm glad California is doing this. So thanks.

MS. NEVILLE: Thank you.

We'll go off the record and we will come back at 10:59 for our next interview.

(Thereupon the interview ended at 10:37 AM)

10:59 AM

MS. NEVILLE: It's 11:00. We're back on the record.

Panelist Dr. Turem has requested that we remind him each five minutes just during the first five standard questions, so we've agreed to do that. But we won't be doing anything differently during your questioning, so it won't be distracting.

Welcome, Dr. Turem. We're going to begin with the five standard questions.

What specific skills do you believe a good Commissioner should possess? Of those skills, which do you possess? Which do you not possess? And how will you compensate for it? Is there anything in your life that would prohibit you or impair your ability to perform the duties of a Commissioner?

DR. TUREM: Thank you.

Section 6827 outlines what the regulations think are the skills that the Commissioner should have. There is about a dozen of them, and there are too many for me to discuss each one, but let me just enumerate them: Gathering and comprehending information, evaluating the validity and significance of the information, using information to locate communities and districts, work effectively as a group member, effective participation in

public hearings, read and understand technical material, basic mathematical skills, computer skills, problem solving in areas of ambiguity, understanding legal issues and principles, effective communication skills, and the personal skills with other members and ability to bring consensus to negotiations.

I tend to agree with those more. I have a couple more I would add: Critical thinking skills and critical listening skills. Not everybody is going to have to have a background in computer modeling so on, so forth, as I do. But we're going to be looking -- I keep saying "we." I'm already there. The Commission is going to have to look at an endless number of Census-based based maps. And while not everyone needs to have this kind of statistical backgrounds, they're not going to be able to look all these maps and think critically about where it cuts lines, what it does to the people in those lines.

Remember, the Census data that they're be dealing with is the block data. The block data solely has information on total population, population over 18, head of household, and the multiple race and ethnic distributions. And that's all it has. It's not a lot. It's enough data obviously to draw lines that would get through the Justice Department review and meet the Voting Rights Act requirements, but it doesn't have a lot of the

stuff that -- people might be interested increasing terms of things like community of interest and so on, so forth. And I'll talk further about some of these things later.

Obviously, leadership skills are going to be very important. And in my imagining what the Commission is going to look like, we are going to have diversity in terms of gender and race and geography and age and all that stuff.

And I want to talk about diversity of skills, because when you look at the tasks that the Commission is going to be facing, starting from the most mundane, they're going to have to create a budget. They're going to have to create a work plan with deadlines and stuff; they have 290 something days to do all this stuff. They're going to have to purchase redistricting software. There's at least half a dozen to a dozen vendors of this kind of software. Not all of it will do everything the Commission will need.

The Commission's going to spend a lot of time probably having to deal with various media. You need to be there, even if we have a staff -- if the Commission has a staff that handles these things. And staff or consultant, nonetheless, somebody on the Commission who would be able to tell them what to do and to follow up and see that they've actually done it. Those would be

important skills to have available.

There's some number of more, but again, I don't want to spend all my time on this particular part of the question.

Which of these skills do I have? Most of them, actually. I have been a senior manager in federal and state government. I was a head of the Policy Research Bureau of the Department of Insurance right up the street. I've done a lot of quantitative policy analysis, data modeling, micro-simulation modeling using all kinds of data sets. I have created and managed budgets.

At one point, I directed the Office of Planning Research and Evaluation, over five federal agencies putting together operational plans as well as five-year plans and budget development processes and that will kind of stuff.

I've written RFPs. At one point in my career, I was at the Urban Institute. I was a bidder on those things. I was a contractor and bid on contracts and grants. So I've been doing a lot of the management end of the line aspects of what the Commission would be doing. And of course, I've done an incredible amount of the quantitative policy analysis and modeling that the Commission would face.

Areas in which I'm probably pretty short in,

there will be people who have had more experience working with media than I have. And while I have been interviewed by both the print and press in various capacities, I've rarely been comfortable with it, nor like the way they handled the outcome of those things. Probably I've found that people who work with the press when I was at the Department of Insurance are highly skilled and there's somebody that's going to do a better job in that.

I have been retired for ten years. Probably some of my specific statistical skills are a little rusty. So if you had someone with more current experience doing these things, they might do a better job than me.

If we have some good IT people on there, they're going to be able to understand the computer programs, communicate to computer staff or consultants better about what needs doing. Probably do a more in-depth job of reviewing computer programs that we're going to have to buy through some kind of competitive process.

The other aspect, probably I know how to negotiate government. We will be working with the demographic unit over at Finance, the Secretary of State, probably General Services. And if we need more budget, we'll be working with the Legislature. And I know how to do those. But there may be people with more current experiences and more current contacts than I have. Almost

everybody has retired.

So you know, there's just things that some people can do better than I and have more current background. If the Commission wants to communicate more broadly and have a Facebook page, somebody besides me is going to do that, because I don't understand that stuff. A lot of the new things that my grandkids are just super whizzes at are just, even with 50 years of experience with computers, are just over my head. I just don't know what they're doing.

I forgot what's the last one --

MS. NEVILLE: Whether there's anything in your life that would impair your ability to do this work.

DR. TUREM: I'm retired. My time is my own. My family is supportive. My health is good. And you know, I'm an hour away if we have to do a lot of things in Sacramento. So that's all good.

MS. NEVILLE: Describe a circumstance from your personal experience where you had to work with others to resolve a conflict or difference of opinion. Please describe the issue and explain your role in addressing and resolving the conflict. And if you're selected to serve on the Citizen's Redistricting Commission, tell us how you would resolve conflict that may arise among the Commissioners.

DR. TUREM: When Prop. 103 passed some years ago,

it defined the way insurers had to calculate premiums for auto insurance. It was new. They had never done that before. And part of the intent of Prop. 103 was to see that premiums were lower than the Los Angeles area. It was a zero sum game. If you lower them in the Los Angeles area, you have to raise them other places. The proposition required a weighting scheme. Safety record had to do more in terms of contributing than anything else.

Next came miles driven on the theory that the more miles you drive, the more risk you're in.

And the third mandatory thing that in order of importance in terms of calculating premium was years of driving experience. And the Commissioner could, at his option, have additional variables that they could use. But the value of all of those calculate your premium had to be less.

Well, miles driven, I think somebody told him that the more risk you're at. All else equal. Well, miles are not all equal. Driving 100 miles between Fresno and Bakersfield on that kind of freeway is not the same as driving 100 miles in rush hour down in L.A. or up and down San Francisco's hills in the fall.

And so calculating it the way the proposition called for created what we call dislocation. It was going

to cause people especially in the northern and eastern rural areas to have very significant increases. It was feared it could have very significant increases in their premiums just even though they didn't do anything different. They were driving like always and then all of a sudden they're going to get a 20, 25 percent hit in their insurance plan.

So the Commissioner, now being a political elected person and the senior staff in general were anxious about what reaction the public would have on this because it obviously put north against south, rural against urban, large urban against small urban and so on, so forth.

I was originally hired to create Policy Research Bureau to work on health insurance, but when that became federalized under Clinton and all the work was being done in Washington, we were freed up to take a look at this issue.

So I investigated it, talked to the actuaries, talked to the people in the department that had done plan reviews, spent a little time talking to the insurers and the consumer groups, and came to a conclusion that the premium calculations are essentially an exercise in algebra. And if it was, we could put it in the computer. And once we got it in the computer, we could do what if

programs with it. So I convinced the Commissioner that this was a way to do it, knowing in the department that we were doing micro-simulation modeling and I don't think anybody in state government ever had, although it wasn't much of a staple back in Washington.

So since he was a czar, he could demand the individual records from the insurers. And we got something like 95 percent of them, some 20 million some-odd records after we worked out the equations.

And then I had this wonderful staff who were very skilled in SAS and SBSS statistical programs. And we went through a whole lot of money on computer time, replicating the calculations of the insurers. And then once we hit about a 99 percent accuracy rate, we were able to go in and model all the what-if kinds of things.

Well, by the time we got done with all of that, it was the end of the Commissioner's term. There had been an election and a new Commissioner was coming in of a different political party. So he decided it would be disruptive to try to put out regs and have a new guy pull them back and put out something else. So it got put on the new Commissioner's slot. He came in with his first team.

I had a new boss, fortunately. He had a degree from the Public Policy School in Berkeley. And so I was

able to relate to him on a professional basis, even though the usual kind of suspicions of new people over the old people in terms of loyalty and so on, so forth.

But anyhow, we were able to finally find a way to work well together. We went and briefed the Commissioner and the senior staff. They agreed this was a good way to go on the way. We had public hearings in Sacramento, San Francisco, and Los Angeles. I explained what we did and my staff guy was there in case anybody had technical questions, the senior political people were there. We had input from the consumer groups and insurers from various advocacy groups. And so we came back and finally got some regulations written. My staff voted them. We got them through the various legislative hurdles and they were the legislation -- they were the regulations for at least 12 years.

MS. NEVILLE: How will the Commission's work impact the state?

Which of these impacts will improve the state the most?

Is there any potential for the Commission's work to harm the state? And if so, in what ways?

DR. TUREM: If you look at what the ideal would be, the Commission would do these wonderful maps. They would be passed unanimously. They would get through the

referendum process and then withstand all the court challenges and there'd be a little chaos around the 2012 election.

But by 2014, hopefully people would feel a little more able to have their voices heard in the electoral process and would have more turnout and maybe an opportunity to elect people who were more interested in problem solving than political posturing. And that would be good things. Those all would be good things.

Is that likely to happen? I have no idea. But I can tell you what may be a possible outcome. The statute requires that you get three votes from each of the three segments or caucuses or whatever you want to call them. Basically, that means that two of the unaffiliated control whether or not anything gets done, because you need three votes from each side and there's only four of them.

And so like in the Legislature, you sort of have -- minorities have a very strong negotiating position because they don't have to go along with stuff. I could see a circumstance in which they didn't get the nine votes and the thing gets thrown into the Supreme Court or the master. And the public will have its view of the disfunction of government reaffirmed and this ground experiment and citizen participation will go down the tubes. And that's not a good thing.

So those are the sorts of things that if you want to fanaticize about outcomes and the things and bad things, those are possibilities.

MS. NEVILLE: Describe a situation where you've had to work as part of a group to achieve a common goal. Tell us about the goal. Describe your role within the group, and tell us how the group worked or did not work collaboratively to achieve this goal. And if you're selected to serve on the Citizen's Redistricting Commission, tell us what you would do to foster collaboration among your fellow Commissioners.

DR. TUREM: There are several things I wanted to talk about, but let me -- just because of time let me just point out one.

I don't know if you remember some years ago there was a great crisis in homeowners' insurance. The insurers threatened to leave the state because their risk by having to offer earthquake insurance was greater than they wanted to tolerate. And so there was a great deal of energy in the Legislature trying to come up with a way to deal with this issue.

And I had to do a study of alternatives to the possibility they were talking about. Had groups of insurers, the lobbyists on behalf of the insurers, the consumers groups, all together. We talked it over. I had

meetings with them separately and in a group. I was astounded. They were so used to hassling each other over the years, they were very professional and actually liked each other on a personal level. So I didn't have a lot of that stuff to deal with, even if they were forceful in presenting their alternative views and things. By the end of it, they all signed off on my report. I allowed them to do their own minority report.

MS. NEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Turem.

That's the 15 minutes on the standard questions -- or 20 minutes. Excuse me. So Mr. Ahmadi, it's now your opportunity for your 20 minutes.

CHAIR AHMADI: Thank you very much. I wouldn't mind if I give Dr. Turem five minutes of my time to just respond to the last question, because I'm anxious to hear from him how he responds to the standard questions as well.

MS. NEVILLE: Great. Thank you.

Would you like to continue with where you left off and then we'll give you more time?

DR. TUREM: Again, the bottom line on that was I worked with a lot of different people to prepare the report and testified on it before the Legislature. These were again a diverse group of people with quite different views and I was able to get consensus.

MS. NEVILLE: A considerable amount of the Commission's work will involve meeting with people from all over California who come from very different backgrounds and very different perspectives. If you're selected to serve on the Commission, tell us about the specific skills you possess that will make you effective at interacting with the public.

DR. TUREM: Well, as a social worker, I don't know how far back you want to go. As a social worker at the San Francisco Welfare Department, I initially worked with the single men's unit of alcoholics. Actually, I became a child welfare worker, working with abused and neglected parents, and became a supervisor and became a senior management assistant over all the clerical staff and a bunch of other parts of the administration in a department. This is back in the 60s. So they come up with this thing called computers, and I became the coordinator of data processing.

I left the department to go to Washington to work on the President's Commission on income maintenance programs with different people in there, mainly economists. I've worked with people from, as I say, from alcoholics to people like Don Watson of IBM and Dan Heinmann of Northwest Industries. And a lot of my work in the public sector I've worked with numerous groups of

people of quite diversity.

If you want to go back quite a ways, you know, I was in the army when they got the draft and everybody in my barracks was quite diverse. We got along quite well.

And when I got out of the army and was going to San Francisco State and worked at the post office part time, most of my work mates were Filipinos and Chinese and black guys. And we just had a great time.

I get along with folks. I've also pretty much had to do that. I was raised in North Carolina in the Baptist belt. Sixth to eighth grade I was the only Jewish kid in my class and whole school. And I pretty much learned how to get along with people, because if you didn't, you could get yourself whacked. And so I've always had good skills in doing that. I was a trained social worker both in group work and in case work.

Among the various things I did back in the 60s when I was in Wisconsin was the extension division, and we did sensitivity training. Civil rights was out in the streets. And those days -- and there was a lot of turmoil in workplaces, such as the child welfare units in Milwaukee welfare department and we went and did sensitivity training around issues like that. So I'm well versed in a lot of these things. Really sensitive listening, listening to what people say and trying to

figure out what they mean.

MS. NEVILLE: Thank you. Very good.

Mr. Ahmadi, 15 minutes.

CHAIR AHMADI: Thank you very much.

Good morning, Dr. Turem, let me start off with a short question. You have been retired ten years. Can you tell us what you have been doing since retirement?

DR. TUREM: Yes. Got rid of all my suits. I quit getting up early.

I have little under 40 acres. And while I don't farm, there's a lot of maintenance on it. I lost eight trees in the last snow storm last year and cutting a lot of wood. Too high for floods and too low for snow. And I'm on 600 feet of granite, so I'm not worried about earthquakes, but I do have a fear of fire. So I spend a lot of time -- we have a redwood house, and I spend a lot of time keeping things cleared around the house and that sort of stuff.

I spend a lot of time on the computer. I've been doing -- musing myself with a lot of things like converting all my old 33-and-a-third to CDs and a lot of my beta and videotapes to DVDs. And I have a complete wood shop. And after, you know, over 30 years of shuffling papers, it's really fun to go down there and come out with something you can touch and feel and smell

and sit on it sometimes.

So we travel some. We wife is still working. She's CFO of a small winery in Napa as well as having her own tax practice, which she's trying to wind down because you can't do both. So we don't travel as much as we'd like. But we travel some. And it's pretty full.

I'm very active. I exercise three times a week. I'm a very, very good cook and we have dinners with our friends and neighbors all the time.

CHAIR AHMADI: Thank you, sir. Very interesting indeed.

In your application, you mentioned that you have had service with the federal government. You say the details will be provided upon request. Will you share with us what were your responsibilities and how long you had been with them? This goes back a number of years, I believe.

DR. TUREM: Yes. My first experience was when I was working on my Doctorate. Lyndon Johnson appointed a Technical Income Maintenance Programs. That's why I had gone back to graduate school. The welfare system could be improved. And I didn't know enough how to do it. So I wanted to get a degree in administration with an emphasis on economics and research and policy analysis.

And while I was working on that, Johnson

appointed the Commission. I was working at the Poverty Institute. I found out who was hiring and found out it was going to be a serious look at all income maintenance programs, not just welfare, but Social Security, health programs, workers' comp, all across the board.

So I talked to the guy who was doing the hiring. And even though he's an economist and had a bias towards hiring economists, he hired me, because he felt I could probably survive in the environment, and I was the only person who actually had experience working in the welfare system.

So that was my first job in Washington. I had planned to do that, finish my dissertation, come back to San Francisco. But while I was there, I met this really attractive young lady with long legs and short skirts and we married now going on 37 years.

So I stayed, moved to OMB when they had set up -- by this time, it was Nixon administration. They had set up a research and evaluation unit in the Office of Management and Budget. And I worked there for a while doing work analyzing the Social Service Programs.

And then the Commissioner of the Rehabilitation Services Administration needed an executive assistant. Heard about me. I ended up doing that for a number of years and helping him create things like the Developmental

Disabilities Act. One year, I traveled 100,000 miles giving speeches at conferences and meetings of rehabs people on his behalf.

From there, the guy I worked for at Income Maintenance Commission had become a really close friends and became the senior vice president to Urban Institute and asked me to go over there and set up the Social Services Research Program, which I did for five years.

And then when Carter came in, Arabella Martinez from Oakland that was Assistant Secretary of Human Department wanted somebody to run her planning, research, and evaluation shop over the five agencies under that umbrella. And so I got hired for that.

And then after President Reagan came in, I became Associate Commissioner of the Administration for Children, Youth, and Families, which had Headstart and child welfare and some programs like that. Again, I handled the research and evaluation and personnel functions, budget end of it, all this kind of stuff.

At a certain point, I got tired of managing other people's stress. Gave up my senior executive slot to negotiate a research position over National Institute of Drug Abuse. At that time, they had set up the Office of National Drug Abuse Policy and Bill Bennett wanted policy stuff down and all the data was over in NIDA. And they

were a science stop. They didn't know anything about policy analysis.

So I worked a deal where I could go over there and be an analyst and just not have to supervise anybody. Started producing a lot of work on everything from IV transmittal, through needle sharing, through how many treatment slots did they need, which OMB was asking for and things like that.

And at that point -- at some point, they wanted me to get my SES back and set up policy research shop there. And because of the eccentricity of the federal retirement system. I would have had to stay another six years. And I didn't want to do that. So I made a deal with them to give ee an early out, which they did. It became effective the end of August. And in September, Sally and I were moving our stuff back to California.

CHAIR AHMADI: Thank you, sir.

Could you tell me in a short response --

DR. TUREM: You really want short.

CHAIR AHMADI: I have a number of questions I'd like to discuss with you, and I would appreciate you to be able to do that.

You worked under both administrations, Republicans and Democrats. And I believe you've declined to state voter --

DR. TUREM: Yes.

CHAIR AHMADI: How did working under two different administrations affect you in terms of your responsibilities to do your job? Which one would you favor and why? Or maybe there is no difference.

DR. TUREM: Not only have I worked with people of both parties, but with extreme ends of both parties. I've worked with very, very liberal Democrats and some not so liberal Democrats. And I worked with very, very conservative Republicans and not so conservative Republicans.

What I found in most of the positions I had is that in general by the time someone's in that kind of a role, they're looking for a way to do something with the program. For the most part, Democrats are trying to expand them and Republicans are trying to make them more efficient.

And most of my positions were such that I could find some areas of agreement because there is a lot of different things you can do to programs and find areas of agreement and go forward with them.

I found that on a one to one basis they're just different people with different skills and different interests and some of them you can like and some of them not. And I'm sort of a nonpartisan when it comes to that.

I take them one at a time.

I have found people who want to do the best for the country where as they're coming from. And as long as they come in with that attitude, I can find a way to work with them.

CHAIR AHMADI: Thank you, sir.

You mentioned that when you returned to California back in 1970s you recognized that the Hispanic population or segment of California population were underly represented.

DR. TUREM: That was in Washington.

CHAIR AHMADI: That was in Washington?

DR. TUREM: Yeah. When Arabella Martinez came in, it was during the civil rights period and everybody was focused on improving participation among African Americans. Arabella, of course, took a look around and said we don't -- Hispanics are even more under-represented. And so she wanted to have a Hispanic initiative and tasked me to figure out how to put it together, because I was pretty good at negotiating the government's various rules and stuff. And we set up a program to bring in interns because the civil service rules to hire people directly were fairly onerous. But we were able to do that, set up a way to recruit people --

MS. HAMEL: Five minutes.

DR. TUREM: And we got people in. Some of them were very suited in the government. And one guy went on to be one of the Associate Commissioners in the Social Security Administration. And others couldn't cut it and didn't make it.

But I think on the whole of the -- I don't know -- 20, 30, 40 that we did, our goal was to get people who stay in the government and probably two-thirds of them did.

CHAIR AHMADI: How would this experience or this knowledge from that experience will help you should you become a Commissioner in performing the Commission's work?

DR. TUREM: Well --

CHAIR AHMADI: How would you apply that knowledge and experience into your work as a Commissioner should you be selected?

DR. TUREM: Well, in general, what you're talking about is, you know, how sensitive am I to the distribution of people by ethnic group in their ability and interest in participating in the political process.

And of course, that's -- I've been active in some form of civil rights ever since the poverty programs when I was at the Welfare Department and used to moonlight helping people in the Community Action Agency understand how they can get the Welfare Department to do better. I'm

sensitive to that. I understand it.

You do have to appreciate though when the Commission work which is primarily going to be looking to be Census data, they're only going to have these distributions that are available in the block things, which is I've described are fairly sparse. Hopefully, there will be people on the Commission who will be able to look at any specific set of boxes that we create and have more direct local experience than I and who will be able to say, look, if you do that, you can affect this group or that group. And so part of the key is going to be the diversity of the Commission itself that's going to help us get through that. But I have a strong preference for making sure everybody can participate.

CHAIR AHMADI: How much time do I have left?

Two and a half minutes. So let me ask you the next question I have.

In your application, you mention -- you state that voting behavior and representation lag behind population statistics. Could you please talk a little more about that and give me some specifics what do you mean by that?

DR. TUREM: The simple answer is if you look at, for example, the number of Hispanics in the state and the number who vote, there is a great divide. If you look at

African Americans although their participation rates are increasing, the participation rate of Hispanics is extremely low. And that's what I mean; that we need somehow to give groups, even though there is a lot of them that sense that they ought to be participating in political process. And one way to do that is to have them have a sense that when they go to the poles they're going to actually make a difference.

MS. NEVILLE: Thank you, sir.

Given that I have a very short I believe minute or so, how important is the geometric shape of a district?

DR. TUREM: On one of your briefings, somebody was worried about it. I call that the aesthetic concern. It doesn't matter. I think some of the weird things we look at now are gerrymandered. But we can't -- symmetry is not going to be one of my guiding principles.

CHAIR AHMADI: Thank you, sir. I have no more questions.

MS. NEVILLE: Ms. Camacho, your 20 minutes.

VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: Thank you.

Hello, Mr. Turem. Some of the information you were saying that would be useful to the Commission would be block data.

DR. TUREM: Yes.

VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: Is there any other data that

you could feel that would be beneficial to the Commission during their work?

DR. TUREM: Yes, there are. I don't know, however -- you're talking about 290 days to do something. The block data, the Census data available, which is intended to be used in redistricting, won't be available until April so -- and maybe the end of April. I think the statute -- the federal statute says not later than the end of April. So the feds, the bureaucrats are going to maybe put it out April 30th. I don't know. But then you have May, June, July, August, September, that's really -- you got almost no time to do anything. You're going to be able to get the report out. So you have to have your decisions made and your public hearings done, because the statute requires them not later than August. So you start backing things up.

The question of taking things -- for example, what used to be the Census Long Form is now called the American Communities Survey. And instead of having a cross-sectional rich data set, such as the Long Form was, now it's a continuous panel survey. So you get current data on an ongoing basis. Well, merging the community survey with much richer data with the block data or even the Census track data which the Census tracks are a series of blocks -- block data is probably going to take months.

And so you don't have the months. And so even though there's a lot of data sets that would be much richer in terms of helping us understand what we're calling community of interest, I don't think in realistic terms we're going to be able to do the kind of file merging kinds of things that it would call for.

Probably there are incidental data, people know from their local areas if you do this here, you're going to cut off between a park and something else. So there will be this kind of qualitative data that will be available in a lot of ways. And obviously what public hearings will give us is going to be good data, but it's not going to be quantitative probably. So I think by and large if you look at the constraints, time constraints, public constraint that the Commission is under, by and large the Census data are what we're going to have to use.

A Census block is not a city block. It's more like 39 city blocks. It could be one big apartment building. It could -- and you aggregate Census blocks up to Census tracks and so on, so forth. And of course, the more you aggregate, the more information you lose.

The redistricting software, as far as I can tell just at a cursory glance, will take these files and translate them into whatever component, whatever box you want to put them in. But again, you've still got this

very scarce picture of what's in that box. And so people will bring to it other information about the real location and where things are and their experience, which is good geographic diversity on a Commission is going to be very important. And the public hearing process is going to help us with that as well.

VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: With that in mind, because that kind of leads to my next question, you mention the limited time available in your application. What do you think the Commission can do prior to receiving the Census information and what do you think the role of consultants will play to the Commissioners?

DR. TUREM: Again, depending on the skill set within the Commission, we will be hiring a staff director, a general counsel, a secretary and probably a clerical support to handle things like travel vouchers and all this kind of stuff.

Beyond that, I don't know whether we'll need to hire a consultant, contractors, or we can work out reimbursement or governmental details. Maybe somebody from the demographics unit, although I'm not optimistic about getting somebody out of that to help us, because they'll be getting the data themselves. And my guess is they're going to have more work than they can do anyway. So the demographer is not going to be happy about turning

people over to us.

But if we can't get something from her, we're going to have to get somebody from somewhere. And whether we do it through a consulting firm or get something out of the university, it's going to be expensive. I did a fantasy budget, three million dollars. Even in that short time frame does not buy everything you would hope it would. So consultants will be very important. And some short terms, some will be for much of the life. Obviously, somebody who really understands the output of the redistricting software, can run that software, who can do the dynamic.

Remember, we're talking about 80 boxes in a big carton. And these are sort of rubberized boxes. And each of those boxes will probably have to have about 500,000 units in it. 450,000 in 2000. But I think the estimates are going to go from about 33 million to close to 40 million people. So if you divide about 80, you have about half a million people. So each of those districts are going to have roughly half a million people.

And these districts if you say, well, I really don't like the way this one is, let's move the boundaries over here, that's going to affect all of the boundaries right around it. So it's a very dynamic problem of optimization. And somebody who is really adept at running

the software and can handle these dynamics and translate them in intelligible terms to the Commission is going to be very important. That pretty much going to be consultants. The consultants is going to be important.

VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: Okay. You were talking about the demographic information that you obtained during your Proposition 103 analysis. What information do you feel that you obtained from the Prop. 103 work that you did that could apply to the Commission's work?

DR. TUREM: Again, we were able to get down to the ZIP code level. In another study that we did on the auto uninsured, we created a program to translate ZIP codes in the Census track so we could go and get all the Census track information out of them. So we knew age and race and transportation modes and all kinds of things like that and those kinds of data again. If we had the time and the resources -- we spent an awful lot of money on computers. I mean, just hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars to do this.

And again, whether -- getting the computer to behave with data sets to do things that you want for data sets that weren't set up to do the thing that you're after takes a long time. And I don't know that we have a long time. Things that we could be doing before the Census data come, well, aside from just organizing ourselves and

hiring staff and working out a budget and figuring out if the budget is adequate and whether we have to go back to the Legislature, you know, all that kind of front end organizational stuff will be there.

I think the statute asks that we do public hearings or get public input early in the process. So they'll be a time consuming kind of effort around that. We'll have to set up hearings around the state and try to get input of various groups and individuals that will give us some kind of sense of their perception of the existing, the good and the bad about the existing districts and sort of what they'd like to see happen. That's going to take some time at the beginning.

And then in April the data come in. Probably by mid May, toward the end of May, the Commission will be getting the first outputs, that first sense of what the 80 boxes might look like. And then they get down to the real difficult aspects of what the real work is going to be.

VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: If you were to start the redistricting, is there a particular point on California where you would start the map?

DR. TUREM: Good question.

When you remember this dynamic that I talked about, maybe you want to start where you have the most constraints where it's the least dynamic. So you might

want to start, let's say, up in the northeast counties. Chances are, those counties have lost population that were up in the northeast counties. Chances are the counties have lost population They were very timber-oriented things. And timber has been shut down for quite a long time now.

Maybe people left, and the existing districts are going to have to expand. But they can't expand in two directions there. So we're either going to have to go west or south. And once you get your half a million people size district there, even though you have couple of options about which way you stretch the box, you have fewer things to worry about there, again just because it's there. And the same thing is probably through down in the southeast counties.

Places like San Francisco to the extent that you don't want anybody to get wet, you've pretty much got a fixed area. They're going to have to go into San Mateo County to get their two districts, because I think they're going to be stable at around 800,000 or something like that. Right now, they dip a little bit into San Mateo County. And I couldn't tell for sure on the map, but it looked like they got a smidgen of Marin. I don't know what that's about. But the new district's probably a little further south into San Mateo County. But because I

want to not get wet, probably that's a pretty fix now. You have a lot of options about how you draw the two districts within that, but that particular area you don't have many.

So again, you have areas in the state -- I'm guessing maybe of the 80 districts probably between 20 and 30 where it's going to be less difficult because of the geography and other things like that to draw the lines and then that will, of course, have implications for the remaining ones. But yeah, you have to start somewhere and it would be better to start somewhere where you have the most constraints so that you have the less problem trying to figure out how to get it done.

VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: One of the questions that Mr. Ahmadi asked you was your federal government work that you did. During that work, did you build relationships with any Congressional individuals or Legislature -- California state legislators?

DR. TUREM: Well, there was one guy who was a staffer on the Committee that handled voc rehab that I would run into from time to time at the Kennedy Center. None of them were people I invited to dinner or anything like that.

But in the Washington they say if you want to get along, go along. And to the extent that I stayed out of

the political end of things. As much as I could, I did not have those kinds of things, although you know periodically if we work on a piece of legislation, I work with whatever staff member on the Legislature was doing that. Here, Masoca handled and my other bosses handled the Legislature for the most part. If I had to, I went up there and worked with somebody. I did a study on long-term care. And I had to work with the people on that Committee and so forth. But again, this was a professional work. No ongoing relationships with them. And we don't send Christmas cards or anything like that.

VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: Obviously, you knew Prop. 11 was coming along. What made you apply since you have a full life on your 40 acres?

MS. HAMEL: Five minutes.

DR. TUREM: The war horse heard the bugle call.

By and large, this is the kind of work I've always done. I have -- I'm sharing a lot of Dan Walter's view of -- dysfunctional view of the California Legislature and government in general, the California government in general.

My grandkids and my daughter are running into all kinds of problems that I never had when I was coming up in California. My daughter's working on her certificate in special education. She can't get the classes she needs.

Two of my granddaughters are in college. They can't get the classes they need. They can't get into the next level of school. Two of my younger grandkids are in schools that are almost in shambles for drugs and gangs and lack of discipline. And while the economy has something to do with some of this, the political system has a lot to do with it. And it just irritate the hell out of me, and I'd like to see it different.

And I originally was saying I was going to do this. And then I said, "Well, I don't really want to get involved again." And my wife just chewed me out and said, "This is something you need to do. This is what you do. You're good at it. You make a good contribution to it. Get off your butt." So I did.

VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: Thank you. That's the last question I have.

MS. NEVILLE: Ms. Spano, your 20 minutes.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Thank you. Good morning.

DR. TUREM: Good morning.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Can you tell us -- you spoke a little bit about your micro-simulation modeling approach. Can you tell me how this approach will help you in this experience as it applies to redrawing state district lines?

DR. TUREM: In effect, what the redistricting

software does is do simulations. It will take these block things and aggregate them up to some number that you say there are other Census files that connect to these things that have the geographic areas of the things that shows the county lines and the city lines and bridges and rivers and all that kind of stuff.

And by and large, these are those kinds of models which if you understand how to make them do what you want are very helpful. And I think somebody that just, you know, has just not an acquaintance with computers is not able to do that. But that's what these things do. You're going to have something with a bunch of boxes in it and you're going to have something inside the boxes and somebody is going to say, gee, I don't like that mix. Let's move this, change this end of the box over there. Well, that's going to change a whole lot of other things. And if you don't understand how that simulation is going to work --

Now, a question I didn't get a chance to answer because I ran out of time is how to deal with collaboration and conflict on the Commission. I'm going to find -- I think you're going to find or the Commission is going to find that once you start getting down to the actual examination of these things, people who, let's say, have an argument that this is not what this set of things

should look like because my particular interest or my particular group is not there, and so you change it. So what they're going to see is after the ripple effects some other area that they're also interested in is going to be adversely effected.

And they're going to have to compromise with themselves as to what is the balance that they want to see because they can't -- if they do this, they have to give up something over here. I think for the most part once you get into that, you're going to see that people are going to not have conflicts with each other but with themselves.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: How do you propose to handle those types of collaborative efforts and manage the conflict?

DR. TUREM: It will depend in part on my role in the Commission. Obviously, if I were Chair, I'd have more tools to do things establishing agendas, setting time frames, setting the ground rules for discourse, insisting on simple discourse. If I'm a peer in the thing there is a different set of skills that would have to be applied, including an occasional nudge in the ribs or a crack a joke or kind of the kind of things you would do in a group of peers where people respect each other and, you know, you're not the enemy. You're one of them. So you have

more tools to use.

I was trained as an EEO mediator in the feds. I did sensitivity training as I mentioned. I took group work as a student from Gertrude Wilson who wrote the book. So I have a number of skills and experiences in terms of how to perform in groups. Obviously, depending on the role, there would be different tools available.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Speaking of your EEO -- thank you. Speaking of your EEO mediator experience, how do you feel that work applies to the decision-making dynamics encountered when facilitating discussion between diverse groups with strongly supposed issues?

DR. TUREM: I just have to respect the experience and where people are coming from. As a social worker, one of the things you're taught when you're in the clinical setting is people are going to say really nasty things about you and you just can't take it personally. That's true in some of these policy things where people are going to abandon rational discussion for personal attack. And you just have to understand they must be losing. And you're going to have to help them along.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: What roles in your Boards and Commission experience -- and what roles are you comfortable with? Facilitator? Member?

DR. TUREM: It depends on what it was and what

the task was and the goals. For a lot of them, I was much happier being in charge than having somebody else in charge, because I knew what I needed to get done.

In other cases, you know, I was very happy to be just a participant. We had a group that was re-writing the surveys of drug abuse surveys that NIDA was putting out. And there were people who were much better at than I was, and I was very happy to be just a participant in that.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Thank you.

How does your community organization during the war on poverty relate to the job of Commissioner? Please expand on its impact on minorities and the handicapped.

DR. TUREM: I'm not sure other than what I learned about working with people and taking people one at a time that the community organization experience will have a big impact.

I watched about a dozen of your interviews, and I've noticed that most of the people were are very locally oriented almost like saying to do the redistricting job you've got to do a community organization kind of thing. Well, as sympathetic as I am to it, we got 290 days and a whole bunch of Census data. And I think to the extent that we can do a lot of outreach that the -- once we have a sense of what the options are for these things that we

go to the 215 or 20 -- can't go to all 80.

So you're going to have a selection of them and we're going to go there and say, look, this is redirecting. This is what we do. This is how we could carve up this thing. There are three or four different ways to do it. Let's hear from you. And I don't see really on the ground from the organization being a big part of this.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Do you feel that communities of interest is a significant part of redistricting?

DR. TUREM: That's a wonderful term of art. And I'm not -- the new initiative has a definition in it, the existing law doesn't. The new initiative talks about a population contiguous, geographic areas, things like agricultural area and stuff. I don't know how much that moves the process along.

When you get down to the minimalist part of it, not the vernacular ideas of communities of interest, you know, Gettys, and the Castro and San Francisco or old people, the Leisure towns or things like that, in a vernacular sense, I think these are communities of interest.

I think in terms of specifics in the task of the Commission, again, communities of interest has got to primarily be ethnics because those are the data you have.

You do not have data on Gettys. You do not have data -- in fact, you don't even have the age distribution in this data set. So you don't know where the Leisure Towns are.

So while I can see that the drafters of the initiative have something in mind that is a very laudable set of objectives, I think practical aspects of what the Commission is going to be faced, the community of interest that we're interested in since the only definition is you can't do political parties, the community of interest that we'll be interested in are the ethnic communities and how to protect them and make sure that they have the opportunity to participate.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Thank you.

Can you describe for us the relevance that you believe of the SAS and SPSS programs to map redrawing?

DR. TUREM: There may be -- I'm not expecting it. But there may be some sub-sets of the Census data that we may want to do some of our own analysis on outside of the redistricting software. And we would need those statistical programs to do them with. One of the -- or SPSS by and large is PC based. SAS while they have the PC program is by and large a main frame program. So it will depend in large part on the sizes of the data sets that would be using. But we may want to take let's say a sample of the Census data and do different kinds of

analysis on them than the redistricting software would allow us.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Do you have any hands-on experience working with communities and doing community outreach and taking public comment and then having to make a decision after?

DR. TUREM: Well, yeah. For example, whenever we wrote regulations for the feds or the State, there was a public process. When I did the -- well, one of the things I didn't get a chance to talk about was a major study I did in Washington Congressionally mandated study of people with most severe handicaps because the department did with the RPF with a year. There was a two-year time frame. And Congress wasn't going to change it. I had to spend a million dollars. I won the contract. I had to spend a million dollars in one year. This was 1972 dollars. So I bought a lot of stuff.

I ended up hiring a staff of 30. We did surveys. We analyzed every data set that had anything to do with the handicapped. I had disabled contractors, Center for Independent Living in Berkeley was the primary one. I had an advisory group of handicap as well as the providers of rehabilitation services. I had probably 15 or 20 consultants of all sorts on everything from workers comp to the people who made prosthetics. And ultimately things

got done on time. I testified before and helped re-write the voc rehab act to serve more severely handicapped people. This was 30 years ago or something. Just a few years ago, somebody from the Pew Foundation called me and asked me if it was updated because they were still using it for a reference.

I do good work. I got an award -- research award for it.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Congratulations.

When you made though decisions and you're developing the policy, did you have a lot of interactions and input with the public on that?

DR. TUREM: The public is another term of art. Yes, there are a lot of relevant people that I wanted to talk to and who wanted to talk to me. And we did. So were some a group setting, some individually.

One of the things the Commission is going to have to face is the obvious people are going to try to lobby you and there are pretty clear restrictions on that. But what are you going to do when your backyard barbecue -- when your next door neighbor comes up and says you're going to have to pay attention to a lot of this stuff as to whether people are trying to influence you.

So the public, yeah. Once you become a Commissioner, your local paper is going to get it in. All

your neighbors are going to be there. You're going to hear from everybody. There's not going to be an issue about public input. You're going to have public input than you can possibly sensibly use.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: How do you propose to handle any bombardment of your neighbors, the community coming up to you if you were selected as a Commissioner?

DR. TUREM: A friend of mine in Washington was the staff director at the Ways and Means Committee in the House. And he said every day at 5:00 he sat down and reviewed his day and said, "Who tried to influence me?" And that's how you do it. And you have to be self aware. You have to understand what's going on. You have to make a reasonable assessment of over whether you want to pay any attention to it or nothing or whether it's something you need to bring to everybody else. Somebody may come up with something really good and you're going to sit down and tell your colleagues about it. But for the most part, except for the constituency organizations that have -- most of the run-of-the-mill kind of people don't have a clue. I talked to a couple of my -- moving their precinct where they vote.

MS. HAMEL: Five minutes.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Thank you.

Do you have any media relations experience?

Media relations experience?

DR. TUREM: I don't understand.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Interacting with the media. Have you ever interacted with the media?

DR. TUREM: Oh, yes. Some. Didn't like it very much. But when I was traveling around a lot making speeches on behalf of the Commissioner, there was usually somebody there from TV and press that asked questions and you know what are you going to do about these budget things and questioning me about the politics and one thing or another. And inevitably, the clip that came out on TV or the article that came out in the paper just had nothing to do with anything I said. But there you go.

Yeah, I've had it. I try to avoid it personally if I can, because I just -- they have their own interests to sell newspapers you need something dramatic and something that sounds like conflict. And even if you didn't tell them that, that's how it will come out.

I remember one time we were working in San Francisco opposing a redevelopment project and we talked to the San Francisco Chronicle people. And the article itself was pretty accurate, but the headline was exactly the opposite of what we said. And so people who just read the headline and took a cursory glance at the article get a very wrong impression.

And that was a lesson that has stuck with me for quite a long time. That's why I think we need a good media relations person on there, because these are people who have contacts and who understand the games that are played, who will make sure that the Commission's real message gets out.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: There's probably a strong possibility that any decisions or discussions that the Commissioners make in public will be highly scrutinized and by the media as well. I know you said you don't like being scrutinized in public --

DR. TUREM: No, that's not what I said. I don't like having to be interviewed where they're in charge. When we're having meetings and we're conscious, this thing is on, everybody is watching, I don't have a problem with that. I expect that will help us, rather than hurt us.

But when somebody comes in from KVIE or KXJA or somewhere and sits down and asked some of these questions and they're kind of ambiguous and you give them the best answer you can and you go back and next day the clip is nothing like you thought you said, that troubles me some. I think there are -- I was very impressed with a lot of the people in the Department of Insurance who handled press relations and were very, very good at it. And I don't think I would be.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Okay. Thank you.

How would you defend your redistricting work if you were challenged in litigation?

DR. TUREM: Well, again, if -- it depends on how it comes out. If it was unanimous and so forth and I get past the referendum, I think we'll be able to make the case that we made rational decisions and the court will defer. I think if we ends up with a bare nine vote majority with a strong minority report, I don't think we'll get past the referendum. If we did, I think we'll be in trouble in the Legislature -- I mean in the courts. You have to defend it in terms of this is the rational basis on which we did this.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Okay. Thank you.

MS. NEVILLE: Are there any follow-up questions right now from panelists?

VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: Not at this time.

CHAIR AHMADI: I'll wait for the end. If I have time, I'll ask a question.

MS. NEVILLE: Very good.

I have just a couple of other questions for you, Mr. Turem. One of the things that we have heard is that the Commission as it starts its work even before it receives its Census data should go out and meet with Californians and find out what they do and do not like

about the current district boundaries, and they should do that well before the data arrives just to really find out what's happening on the ground. What do you think of that idea?

DR. TUREM: It's in the statute, so we pretty much have to do it. I think we have to think carefully. I keep saying "we." It's not a presumption. But I'm hoping if. The Commission has to think carefully about who it wants to get input from.

Like I said, when I talked to, you know, a lot of my neighborhoods, they thought I was talking about moving the precinct. They didn't even after I tried to explain we're going to change the boxes, you know, the districts and you may not be able to get the vote for the same people and they said well, okay. So what we're going to get probably in the early stage are the constituency groups, the NAACP, LAZA, all of these people who really understand what's at stake here. And they will come in and tell us pretty much their view of what districts are good, what districts are not good, what they'd like to leave alone, what they'd like to see changed. And that's important information for us I think.

And we'll -- once you start this process and you see what the existing map looks like and they're telling you change this, change this, change this, and then you

sit down, you know, you try to set an agenda for looking at that. And then the data come in, maybe you can change it like they want and maybe not.

The problem I think one of your candidates was talking about a local redistricting thing where after a really long time they didn't change anything. I think we have to change things. I think the nature of the data will force that upon us.

I think we would like to change things objectively and not be accused of simply reaffirming the 2000 distributions that were so badly criticized as an incumbent protection distribution. But my guess is that on the whole a lot of the districts are going to be pretty similar. The general mix of R&Ds in the Legislature may not change a lot early. I mean, 2012 election probably is not going to see a big change. Maybe the 2014 will. But I don't know about that.

But anyhow, again, even if we provide the opportunity, you don't know if people are going to take it.

MS. NEVILLE: What would you do to really encourage people to avail themselves of that opportunity?

DR. TUREM: Well, you know, I'm a big believer in how much you can sell people on things. You know, we buy a lot of stuff because of advising and presumably we're

Commissioners for the decade, but I don't know what it is we do after September. But if we did have a role, it would be getting out and promoting the idea that you've got a chance to make a difference. Get out there and vote. But you know, even though presumably you were appointed for the decade, it doesn't say what we do after September. I don't know where that comes out.

MS. NEVILLE: I want to ask you just a little bit more as a follow up to some of Ms. Spano's questions about identification of communities of interest.

As you probably know from reading the initiative, one of the things that the Commission will hire is a legal expert, someone who is very much an expert in the voting rights act. If that expert were to advise you that as you identify communities of interest that you really do need to take into account now just race or ethnicity or the quantitative information you get from the Census data, but that you really do need to take into account in your decision making more qualitative information, if that were so, is that advise that you would heed and take into account in your decision making?

DR. TUREM: Well, hopefully counsel if he or she says that they will tell me how to do it. We can do the qualitative data, and I expect we will. I mean, you're going to look at an area that say somebody is from east

L.A. or something and we're going to look at that box and they're going to say look, I know this place. And you do this and this is going to happen. And that kind of qualitative input is going to be very important.

But it has to be authoritative. It doesn't have to be data driven, but it has to be authoritative. Somebody that is telling you these things in a qualitative sense that you really can trust they know what they're talking about. Remember, if you don't have the data, you don't know the scale of things. You can't say, gee, I want more of these people here, and they're not in the data set, you don't know how many there are. You don't know where they are. And so, yeah, I think qualitative data -- I have done many studies using qualitative data, case studies and things like that. There's a whole social science methodology around that.

But for the most part, I think we have to stick with our data and then find out where we can use qualitative.

MS. NEVILLE: You spoke earlier about the use of consultants to guide the Commission and its work. If you are elected to serve on the Commission, what would you do to make sure that consultants worked at the direction of the Commission and not the other way around?

DR. TUREM: It's always a problem. And my sense

is the people who survive all of this process and get past the crap shoot part of it and end up on the Commission, they're going to be strong people. And they're going to know pretty much what it is they want to do and they're not going to want to get screwed over.

So pretty much I think we're going to have people on the Commission who make very clear, especially if we had the skill diversity I was talking about -- they're pretty much going to direct the staff and not be directed by the staff. I think they'll be respectful of people's expertise. They're going to listen to the consultants. They're going to listen to counsel.

But by and large, I think these are going to be strong intelligent people with critical thinking skills who know where they want to go and know where they come out. And I don't see this particular Commission -- this is not an imperial commission like the Income Maintenance Commission where people came in every three months or every six months and the staff briefed them and then they tried to understand what was going on and maybe gave a little bit of direction and went away and the staff did all the work. I don't see this Commission working that way. I think it's going to be a working Commission and people are going to roll up their sleeves and make sure that staff and consultants do what they're supposed to.

MS. NEVILLE: You clearly have very extensive experience in the world of public administration. I wanted to ask you in terms of coming up to speed on redistricting law and the topics related to redistricting, how would you quickly come up to speed in that area?

DR. TUREM: Well, I've already been doing a lot of reading. But I'm assuming that one of the -- I'm not the only one. I'm assuming one of the early things we all be doing is bringing in experts in this area to brief us and to direct us to the materials that we need to be familiar with and so forth.

I think on one of your webcasts you had a chap who talked an awful lot about it. He was the one worried about the aesthetics of the district lines and whether the Commission was going to worry about that. But he was very knowledgeable. And we would want somebody like him to come in fairly early and lay this stuff out and counsel has to have experience in Voting Rights Act. We're going to listen to him. We're -- or her. And we're going to find out what some of the case law is on it. And I think the briefings and them being directed to the material will be something all of us will need to do to get up to speed. I won't be the only one.

MS. NEVILLE: I have nothing further. Are there questions from the panel?

CHAIR AHMADI: You actually asked one of the questions I was planning to ask. Thank you. No more questions.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: I have none.

VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: As you know, the Commission is going to be made up of various individuals. Do you think there should be a certain skill set that the Commissioners should have when they come in?

DR. TUREM: Well, again, there are things that every Commissioner should be able to do and obviously having some analytical capability and all those things that the regulations said are good things to do. I have no specific idea other than what I'd like to see, which is that skill diversity that I mentioned. But after this process is over, this particular interview process and the 60 people are there, after that, you have no idea what the Commission is going to look like.

When you get down to a random selection of that last eight -- that first eight, random is random. You're going to have a pool of about 28 people to pull from, that means you've got a one in three chance of being on it and a two in three chance of not being on it. And random is random. You could end up with eight people, eight white male Ph.D.s from southern California, because random is random. And that's what could happen. Probably won't.

But random selection means that you may not get the diversity that you're hoping for. You may not get the skill sets that you're hoping for. You may get -- the theory is those 28 people are all qualified. But it's like a class of 28 in which everybody is an A student, some are A-, and are A, and some are A+. And the chances are you may not get any of the honor students. You may not even get any of the A+ students.

So whoever wrote that part of the initiative I think was fixed on the idea that random selection would look unbiased. But it may end up because as far as I can tell, the auditors in picking you poor souls was able to go back and select and randomly. This is going to be one shot as I read it. Counsel can correct me on this. But it's one shot. All the names go in a hat. Eight names come out. Those are the eight names. And you may or may not get that diversity, that skill distribution and all the other things that you really, really hope for. Because random is random.

VICE CHAIR CAMACHO: Thank you. That was my last question.

CHAIR AHMADI: If I have time, although I did say I don't have any questions, but in regards to what you just said, the eight Commissioners will have a chance to select the remainder six. What approach would you take,

should you be one of the white male eight Commissioners that were randomly selected?

DR. TUREM: If I can convince the rest of them to take my slate -- and some of the people that I saw that I thought were really terrific weren't selected, I would put a slate together of primarily minorities and women and work like hell to try to convince the rest of them my slate was the best slate and we needed that. Again, you don't know how it's going to play out.

CHAIR AHMADI: Thank you, sir.

MS. HAMEL: One minute.

MS. NEVILLE: So Dr. Turem, you have one minute if you wish to make a closing statement.

DR. TUREM: I just want to tell you folks as a career civil servant I'm impressed and awed at the professionalisms and the patience that you guys have presented slogging through this process. I've been on panels that maybe had 50, 100 applicants on it for a job or maybe 20 or 30 contracts. The scale you guys are working on is just absolutely breathtaking. And I just hope the powers that be appreciate the professionalism and the excellence with which you've performed here.

MS. NEVILLE: Thank you for coming to see us.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Thank you.

MS. NEVILLE: We will break and come back at

12:59.

(Thereupon the Panel recessed at 12:30 PM)